MO DESE Effective Evaluation Implementation Rubric

Principle 1: Performance of educators is measured against research-based, proven expectations and performance targets consistent with the improvement of student achievement.			
Indicators		**Criteria**	**Criteria met?**
Educator performance targets are research-based and proven. Performance targets align to appropriate state and national standards. Performance targets articulate essential practices. Performance targets are clearly articulated. Performance targets of the educator link to improvements in student learning.	**Policy Documents**	The district has adopted one of the following models or a model based on the state standards: the Missouri State Model, Danielson Model, Marzano Model, Network of Effective Educators (NEE/MU) Model If district is using a district developed model, or another model, the district: - cites research and theory used in developing performance targets in their evaluation documents. - has a crosswalk or alignment study that shows alignment between district standards and national or state teacher or leader standards. - has a crosswalk or alignment study that some of the performance targets have high effect sizes. - district documents demonstrate that a majority of the districts' teacher and leader performance targets include links to student evidence	**Fully Met** – using listed model or district model that meets all criteria **Partially met** – using district model that meets the majority of criteria **Not met** – district model that does not meet the majority of criteria
	Practice Data from Surveys	The majority of survey respondents on each survey agree or strongly agree with the following statements: - The teacher/principal evaluation rubrics/growth guides clearly define what is expected of me as a teacher/principal. *(Teacher [Question 1a] and Principal [Question 1a] surveys)* - The teacher/principal evaluation rubrics/growth guides are appropriate for my position. *(Teacher [Question 1c] and Principal [Question 1c] surveys)* - The teacher evaluation system is fair to teachers in all classrooms, content and grade levels. *(Teacher survey [Question 1e])* I have improved my practice as a result of the teacher/principal evaluation system *(Teacher [Question 1g] and Principal [Question 1f] surveys)* - The teacher evaluation rubrics/growth guides available to me are appropriate to all of the positions that I evaluate. *(Principal survey [Question 7b])*	**Fully Met** – meets all practice criteria **Partially met** – meets the majority of practice criteria **Not met** – does not meet the majority of practice criteria
Overall Principle 1 Rating		***Fully Met** – meets policy and practice criteria* ***Partially met** – meets or partially meets either policy or practice criteria*	***Does not meet** – does not meet policy nor practice criteria*

Principle 2: Multiple ratings are used to differentiate levels of educator performance.			
Indicators	**Criteria**		**Criteria met?**
Includes a minimum of 3 differentiated levels. Includes clear statements of performance at each level. Each level allows for discrete, independent, measureable performance targets. Each level appropriately describes practice. Levels provide clear direction for growth and development in practice.	**Policy Documents**	The district has adopted one of the following models or a model based on the state standards: the Missouri State Model, Danielson Model, Marzano Model, Network of Effective Educators (NEE/MU) Model If district is using a district developed model, or another model, the model: - includes rubrics or scoring guides include at least three levels. - includes rubrics or scoring guides that have a differentiated statement at each level. - includes rubrics or scoring guides that have a differentiated rating at each level. - includes rubrics or scoring guides that include a logical sequence of growth.	**Fully Met** – using listed model or district model that meets all criteria
			Partially met – using district model that meets the majority of criteria
			Not met – district model that does not meet the majority of criteria
	Practice Data from Surveys	The majority of survey respondents on each survey agree or strongly agree with the following statements: - The teacher evaluation rubrics/scoring guides provide a clear path for improving teacher practice. *(Teacher [Question 1d], Principal [Question 7c] and District Administrator [Question 1b] surveys)* - The principal evaluation rubrics/scoring guides provide a clear path for improving principal practice. *(Principal [Question 1d] and District Administrator [Question 3b] surveys)* - The teacher evaluation rubrics/scoring guides clearly describe what teachers should know and do to earn each rating score. *(Teacher [Question 1b], Principal [Question 7a], and District Administrator [Question 1a] surveys)* - The principal evaluation rubrics/scoring guides clearly describe what principals need to know and do to earn each rating score. *(Principal [Question 1b] and District Administrator [Question 3a] surveys)*	**Fully Met** – meets all practice criteria
			Partially met – meets the majority of practice criteria
			Not met – does not meet the majority of practice criteria
Overall Principle 2 Rating	*Fully Met – meets policy and practice criteria*	*Partially met – meets or partially meets either policy or practice criteria*	*Does not meet – does not meet policy nor practice criteria*

Principle 3: A probationary period of adequate duration is provided to ensure sufficient induction and socialization through developmental support for new teachers and leaders.			
Indicators		**Criteria**	**Criteria met?**
Includes required mentoring as a component of a comprehensive induction process. Complies with Missouri statute regarding the probationary period. Is informed by the state's mentor standards.	**Policy Documents**	District documents indicate that mentoring is required for new teachers and principals. District documents describe a mentor program that is aligned to the MO mentor standards. (2 years for teachers, 2 years for principals) District policies state that mentors will not share information about their mentee and the information will not be used for adverse job action purposes. District documents highlight essential practices for new educators (years 1-2) including, but not limited to, those practices identified by MO DESE in documents such as the Model Evaluation System. - AND/OR District documents highlight other practices for new teachers and provide a rationale for inclusion of these practices	**Fully Met** – district documents describe a mentoring system that meets all policy criteria
			Partially met – district documents describe a mentoring system that meets the majority of policy criteria
			Not met – district documents do not describe a mentoring system or less than the majority of policy criteria are met
Includes confidential, non-evaluative support linked to the district's overall plan for professional development. Focuses on essential practices of particular significance for novice practitioners.	**Practice Data from Surveys**	The majority of survey respondents on each survey agree or strongly agree with the following statements: - The mentoring process is non-evaluative. *(Teacher [Question 12a] and Principal [Question 18a] surveys)* - The professional development and training I receive throughout the school year is tailored to my specific needs as identified in my evaluation. *(Teacher [Question 5f] and Principal [Question 18b] surveys)* - The support I received from my mentor has helped me improve my practice. *(Teacher [Question 12b] and Principal [Question 18c] surveys)* - My mentor provided me with the resources I needed to improve my practice. (*Teacher [Question 12c] and Principal [Question 18d] surveys)* My mentor provided effective support to me. (*Teacher [Question 12d] and Principal [Question 18e] surveys)* - I had the resources needed to provide support to my mentee(s). *(Mentor survey [Question 1b])* - I received the training needed to become an effective mentor. *(Mentor survey [Question 1a])*	**Fully Met** – meets all practice criteria

Principle 3: A probationary period of adequate duration is provided to ensure sufficient induction and socialization through developmental support for new teachers and leaders.		
Indicators	**Criteria**	**Criteria met?**
Practice Data from Surveys	- The support I provided to my mentee(s) helped them to improve their practice. (*Mentor Survey [Question 1c]*) - I align mentor support to teacher needs identified in their evaluation. *(Principal survey [Question 13a])* - I actively participate in identifying and assigning effective mentors. *(Principal survey [Question 13b])* - My district has a comprehensive system for training effective mentors. *(Principal survey [Question 13c])* The majority of mentors will report that they offered and the majority of teachers will report that they received the majority of the following experiences (6 or more)(*Teacher [Question 13] and Mentor [Question 3] surveys)*: - Frequent, targeted feedback - Opportunities to observe expert teachers - Assistance with developing strategies - A review of school and district expectations - Collaborative development of lesson plans - Collaborative look at student data - The development of a growth plan based on needs - Opportunities to self-reflect on practice - Setting of goals aimed at improving instruction - Modeling of effective teaching practices The majority of principals will report that they were offered the majority of the following experiences (6 or more) (*Principal survey [Question 19]*): - Frequent, targeted feedback - Opportunities to observe expert leaders - Assistance with developing strategies - Collaborative look at student data - Suggestion of resources - Opportunities to self-reflect on practice	**Partially met** – meets the majority of practice criteria

Principle 3: A probationary period of adequate duration is provided to ensure sufficient induction and socialization through developmental support for new teachers and leaders.		
Indicators	**Criteria**	**Criteria met?**
Practice Data from Surveys	- Setting of goals aimed at improving instruction - Discussion of school personnel issues - Discussion of legal issues - Discussion of time management issues - Discussion of school budget 100% of mentors report that they met with their mentee 6 or more times during the school year (*Mentor survey [Question 2]*). 100% of principals report that they have an assigned mentor, **AND** they met with their mentor regularly this school year (*Principal survey [Question 17]*). - 100% of new teachers report that they have a district or school assigned mentor **AND** they met with their mentor 6 or more times this school year (*Teacher survey [Question 11]*).	**Not met** – does not meet the majority of practice criteria
Overall Principle 3 Rating	*Fully Met* – *meets policy and practice criteria*	*Partially met* – *meets or partially meets either policy or practice criteria*	*Does not meet* – *does not meet policy nor practice criteria*

Principle 4: Measures of growth in student learning across two points in time are included as a significant contributing factor in the evaluation of professional practice at all levels.			
Indicators		**Criteria**	**Criteria met?**
Is a significant contributing component of the overall evaluation process Uses multiple measures of student performance, including both formative and summative assessments.	**Policy Documents**	The district is using the state-developed SLO process, or district documents indicate: - how student growth is calculated into the evaluation score and offers a justification for how it's a significant component. - that student growth must be based on two or more sources for determining student performance. - which possible measures of student growth could be included in evaluations, including district and school-determined assessments when state assessments are not available. - that student growth is defined as student learning across two points in time that measures should include multiple years of comparable data (of similar content and format). - which measures of student growth provide comparable data over years. - that state assessment data must be used as one of the measures of student growth for teachers in tested grades and subject areas. - there is an approval process for district or school assessments.	**Fully Met** – using the state-developed SLO process or district documents describe a system for incorporating student growth that meets all policy criteria **Partially Met** – district documents describe a system for incorporating student growth that meets the majority of policy criteria **Not met** – district documents do not describe a system for incorporating student growth or does not meet the majority of policy criteria
Includes multiple years of comparable student data. Highlights growth in student learning across two points in time as opposed to simple measures of status. Includes the state assessment where available and additional district and school determined common assessments.	**Practice Data from Surveys**	The majority of survey respondents on each survey agree or strongly agree with the following statements: - My impact on student growth is a significant part of my evaluation. *(Teacher [Question 2b] and Principal [Question 2b] surveys)* - I believe that the student growth measures used in my evaluation reflect my contribution to student learning. *(Teacher [Question 2a] and Principal [Question 2a] surveys)* - My district has defined what it means for student growth to be a significant contributing component in our teacher evaluation system. *(Teacher [Question 2c], Principal [Question 2c] and District Administrator [Question 5b] surveys)* My district has defined what it means for student growth to be a significant contributing component in our principal evaluation system. *(Principal [Question 11a] and District Administrator [Question 5a] surveys)* - Our district approves the student assessments that will be used in the teacher evaluation system to measure student growth for each content area and grade level. *(Principal [Question 11c] and District Administrator [Question 5d] surveys)* - Our district approves the student assessments that will be used in the principal evaluation system to measure student growth. *(Principal [Question 2d] and District Administrator [Question 5c] surveys)* -	**Fully Met** – meets all practice criteria

Principle 4: Measures of growth in student learning across two points in time are included as a significant contributing factor in the evaluation of professional practice at all levels.			
Indicators		**Criteria**	**Criteria met?**

	Practice Data from Surveys	- In our district, accountability around growth measures is comparable across grade levels and content areas. *(Principal [Question 11b] and District Administrator [Question 5e] surveys)*
		
		The majority of respondents (teachers, principals, and district administrators) indicate that student growth in their district's teacher evaluation system includes (*Teacher [Question 3], Principal [Question 12], and District Administrator [Question 6] surveys*):
		  - Multiple measures
		  - Formative data
		  - Summative data
		  - Multiple years of comparable student data
		  - State assessments (for grades/contents with state assessment data)
		  - Additional district and school determined common assessment(s)
		  - Student growth across two points in time
		
		The majority of respondents (principals and district administrators) indicate that student growth in their district's principal evaluation system includes (*Principal [Question 3] and District Administrator [Question 7] surveys*):
		  - Multiple measures
		  - Formative data
		  - Summative data
		  - Multiple years of comparable student data
		  - State assessments (for grades/contents with state assessment data)
		  - Additional district and school determined common assessment(s)
		  - Student growth across two points in time
			Partially met – meets the majority of practice criteria
			
			Not met – does not meet the majority of practice criteria

Overall Principle 4 Rating		*Fully Met* – meets policy and practice criteria *Partially met* – meets or partially meets either policy or practice criteria	*Does not meet* – does not meet policy nor practice criteria

Principle 5: Ongoing, timely, deliberate and meaningful feedback is provided on performance relative to research-based targets.			
Indicator		**Criteria**	**Criteria met?**
Is delivered effectively and is meaningful to the improvement of practice Focuses on the impact of professional practice to increase student learning	**Policy Documents**	District documents (such as, feedback forms or observation forms) provide a framework to evaluators for providing effective feedback. District documents describe an observation feedback schedule in which feedback is offered at least once annually (either formally or informally).	**Fully Met** – District documents describe a system of feedback meeting all criteria
			Partially met – District documents describe a system of feedback, meeting only one criteria
			Not met – District documents do not describe a system of feedback or no criteria were met
Is offered at least once annually to everyone either formally, informally or both Is offered in close proximity to the data gathering process (i.e. observation, survey, artifact review, etc.) Occurs within the context of a professional, collaborative culture	**Practice Data from Surveys**	The majority of survey respondents on each survey agree or strongly agree with the following statements: - The feedback I received from my evaluator is given in the spirit of continuous improvement. (*Teacher [Question 5b] and Principal [Question 5d] surveys*) - The feedback I have received from my evaluator helped me to become a more effective teacher/principal. (*Teacher [Question 5c] and Principal [Question 5a] surveys*) - My evaluator's feedback included specific strategies that I could use to improve my practice. (*Teacher [Question 5d] and Principal [Question 5b] surveys*) - I have used my evaluator's feedback to improve my practice. (*Teacher [Question 5e] and Principal [Question 5c] surveys*) - The feedback I provide to teachers is linked to research based practices (*Principal [Question 7k] survey*)	**Fully Met** – meets all practice criteria
		- Our evaluators provide feedback in the spirit of continuous improvement (*District Administrator [Question 1k] survey*) - I am evaluated on whether I provide feedback to teachers each year (*Principal [Question 1e] survey*) - My district holds principals accountable for providing feedback to each teacher each year (*District Administrator [Question 1j] survey*) - In general, my evaluator provides feedback within two working days (*Teacher [Question 6] and Principal [Question 6] surveys)* - The feedback I receive from my evaluator promotes a professional collaborative school culture. (*Teacher [Question 5a] survey*)	**Partially met** – meets the majority of practice criteria

Principle 5: Ongoing, timely, deliberate and meaningful feedback is provided on performance relative to research-based targets.			
Indicator	**Criteria**		**Criteria met?**
	The majority of teachers and principals indicate that they have received feedback at least once from their evaluator during this school year. (*Teacher [Question 4] and Principal [Question 4] surveys*) The majority of principals indicate that they provide feedback at least once per year to each teacher (*Principal Survey [Question 8]*) The majority of district administrators indicate that as an evaluator they provide feedback at least once per year to each principal. (*District Administrator survey [Question 4]*)		**Not met** – does not meet the majority of practice criteria
Overall Principle 5 Rating	***Fully Met** – meets policy and practice criteria*	***Partially met** – meets or partially meets either policy or practice criteria*	***Does not meet** – does not meet policy nor practice criteria*

Principle 6: Standardized, periodic training is provided for evaluators to ensure reliability and accuracy		
Indicator	**Criteria** || **Criteria met?**

Indicator		Criteria	Criteria met?
Evaluators demonstrate skills aligned to minimum quality assurance standards established by districts and/or state. Training includes conducting observations focused on the quality of instruction. Assessing student data, analyzing artifacts, and interpreting survey information occur. Time for the effective delivery of meaningful feedback is incorporated. Training is offered both initially and periodically to those who evaluate educator performance.	**Policy Documents**	District requires evaluators to use the components of the MOST System on a regular basis. If not, district requires evaluator training on a regular basis that includes the following: - procedures for insuring inter-rater reliability - providing effective feedback - assessing student data - analyzing artifacts - interpreting survey information - opportunities for evaluators to demonstrate and practice evaluation skills including observations and providing feedback	**Fully Met** – using the components of the MOST System or district documents describe a system of evaluator training meeting all criteria
			Partially met – District documents describe a system of training meeting the majority of criteria
			Not met – District documents do not describe a system of training or less than a majority of criteria were met
	Practice Data from Surveys	The majority of survey respondents on each survey agree or strongly agree with the following statements: - I have been assessed on my ability to reliably and accurately evaluate teachers. (*Principal survey [Question 9b]*) - My district provides standardized training on the teacher evaluation system for all evaluators. (*Principal [Question 9a] and District Administrator [Question 1i] surveys*) The following topics were included in principal training on the teacher evaluation system (*Principal [Question 10] and District Administrator [Question 2] surveys*): o procedures for ensuring inter-rater reliability o providing effective feedback o assessing student data o analyzing artifacts o interpreting survey information o opportunities for evaluators to demonstrate and practice evaluation skills including observations and providing feedback	**Fully Met** – meets all practice criteria
			Partially met – meets the majority of practice criteria
			Not met – does not meet the majority of practice criteria
Overall Principle 6 Rating	***Fully Met** – meets policy and practice criteria*	***Partially met** – meets or partially meets either policy or practice criteria*	***Does not meet** – does not meet policy nor practice criteria*

Indicator	Criteria		Criteria met?
Principle 7: Evaluation results and data are used to inform decisions regarding personnel, employment determinations, and human resource policies such as promotion, retention, dismissal, induction, tenure, compensation, etc.			
Guides district decisions regarding employment determinations	**Policy Documents**	District policies indicate that evaluation results are used for: - retention of high-quality staff - dismissal - tenure - where applicable, compensation increase - growth and improvement plans - planning and delivering professional development - recognizing or rewarding staff	**Fully Met** – District documents describe the use of evaluation results in employment policies meeting all criteria
Informs in particular those policies that impact the extent of student learning Empowers the district to recognize and utilize highly effective educators			**Partially met** – District documents describe the use of evaluation results in employment policies meeting the majority of criteria
			Not met – District documents do not describe the use of evaluation results in employment policies or no criteria were met
Informs district strategies for providing targeted interventions and support	**Practice Data from Surveys**	The majority of survey respondents on each survey agree or strongly agree with the following statements: - The teacher evaluation system provides evaluators with the information they need to make well informed personnel decisions. (*Principal [Question 7d] and District Administrator [Question 1c] surveys*) - The results from the teacher evaluation system are used within the district to inform comprehensive school improvement plans. (*District Administrator survey [Question 1e])* - The results from the teacher evaluation system are used to inform our comprehensive school improvement plans. (*Principal survey [Question 7f])* - The results from the teacher evaluation system are used to recognize or reward effective teachers. (*Teacher [Question 1f], Principal [Question 7h] and District Administrator [Question 1g] surveys*) - The results from the teacher evaluation system inform decisions on how to utilize highly effective teachers. (*Principal [Question 7g] and District Administrator [Question 1f] surveys*) - The teacher evaluation system provides evaluators with the information they need to offer professional development opportunities that are linked to faculty needs. (*Principal [Question 7e] and District Administrator [Question 1d] surveys*) - The results from the teacher evaluation system are used to inform decisions about providing targeted interventions and support (e.g., professional development, performance plans, etc.). (*Principal [Question 7i] and District Administrator [Question 1h] surveys*)	**Fully Met** – meets all practice criteria
			Partially met – meets the majority of practice criteria

		- The principal evaluation system provides evaluators with the information they need to make well informed personnel decisions. (*District Administrator survey [Question 3c]*) - The principal evaluation system provides evaluators with the information they need to offer professional development opportunities that are linked to administrator needs. (*District Administrator survey [Question 3d]*) - The results from the principal evaluation system are used to inform district improvement efforts. (*District Administrator survey [Question 3e]*) - The results from the principal evaluation system are used to identify effective administrators. (*District Administrator survey [Question 3f]*) - The results from the principal evaluation system are used to recognize or reward effective administrators. (*District Administrator survey [Question 3g]*) - The results from the principal evaluation system are used to inform decisions about providing targeted interventions and support to administrators. (*District Administrator survey [Question 3h]*)	**Not met** – does not meet the majority of practice criteria
Overall Principle 7 Rating	***Fully Met** – meets policy and practice criteria*	***Partially met** – meets or partially meets either policy or practice criteria*	***Does not meet** – does not meet policy nor practice criteria*